DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 531 CS 213 700

AUTHOR Beard, Pauline; Danielson, Susan
TITLE Teacher to Teacher: A Dialogue on the "Art" of Teaching English.
PUB DATE [93]
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS English Curriculum; *English Instruction; Higher Education; High Schools; Secondary School Teachers; Student Centered Curriculum; Summer Programs; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *English Teachers; Focus Groups Approach; Portland State University OR

ABSTRACT

The English Department at Portland State University (Oregon) sponsored a roundtable discussion (revolving around classroom practice, perspectives, pedagogies, and methodologies) of public school, community college, and university English teachers in the winter of 1991 and expanded the dialogue into a focus group during the summer. A survey questionnaire was returned by 50 of 86 randomly sampled high school, community college, and university English teachers in the Portland area. Thirty-one respondents participated in the focus group. Group discussions can be categorized under three headings: changes, concerns, and methods. Most teachers agreed that their classes had become more student-oriented, and that writing classes were becoming more text-based to develop reading and analytic skills. Methodological issues discussed included: (1) basing discussion on the students' own questions in place of the usual lecture format with questions proposed by the teacher; (2) encouraging students to become responders and to use the teacher as a resource; (3) use of other art forms to get into a text; and (4) encouraging different voices and accepting multiculturalism as the "humanely/educationally correct thing to do." Many teachers raised the concern of grading when teaching in a more relaxed, less-structured class, and some worried over the letting-go of their role as lecturer in the classroom. Participants in the focus groups were unanimously enthusiastic about the opportunity to share with others their successes and concerns about their teaching. (A summary of the results from the questionnaire, the questionnaire, a list of preliminary questions under consideration, and a sampling of multicultural texts/tapes/videos of works of interest are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354531

Pauline Beard and Susan Danielson

Teacher to Teacher: A Dialogue on the "Art" of Teaching English*

In the Winter of 1991, The English Department at Portland State University sponsored a unique roundtable discussion as part of its annual seminar series. Six teachers of English, from Portland area public schools, community colleges, and PSU came together to discuss their classroom practice, their perspectives, pedagogies, and methodologies. Our program's title, "Teacher to Teacher: A Dialogue on the 'Art' of Teaching English" reflected two central assumptions about our purpose. Our primary aim was to identify the areas of commonality among those of us who are professionally similar, but for a variety of reasons are either isolated from or distrustful of one another. By emphasizing the "art" of teaching, our second aim was to provide an alternative forum to conduct assessment; rather than quantitative data documenting classroom practices and procedures, we hoped to allow for the "free play of ideas" among a group of experienced teachers known for their expertise in the classroom.

While there are clear and important differences among the three settings represented at our seminar, in workload, teacher and discipline

---

*We would like to thank Kathi Ketcheson of PSU's Department of Institutional Research, and Armando Laguardia, PEN Coordinator for their help in conducting our study. Kathi designed our questionnaire and helped us analyze our data and Armando prepared an overview of literature in the field of high school - college collaboration. Melody Wilson was our research assistant, whose calm and organizational skills were sorely needed by novice researchers, and greatly appreciated.

CS213700

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P.W. Beard
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

preparation, range of student ability, etc., we also share a larger sphere: our students and our subject matter, our goals and our communties are generally the same. Through the course of this initial dialogue, certain common themes and concerns emerged: these teachers generally felt isolated from each other; their classrooms are more student-centered than a decade ago; they approach writing as a process, and they no longer consider testing the primary means of evaluation and assessment. At the urging of participants and audience members, we decided to expand the dialogue by applying for a small grant to allow us to replicate our initial format. Armando Laguardia supplied a background (a summary of which follows) which suggests the concept of our project is part of a broad impulse throughout the profession.

The "Partnership Movement"

Interinstitutional cooperation between colleges and high schools has enjoyed a long history in the United States. Until the turn of the century, higher eduation played a major role in nurturing curriculum development and setting standards for high school education. The most common interrelationship between these institutions exists in the area of teacher preparation. Most schools of education have implemented some type of practicum experience that places their students in school classrooms. Other forms of inter-institutional collaboration have been developing in recent years fueled by the changing nature of the student population, school-college articulation, and the dwindling resources for education. In fact, most of the 1,286 colleges and universities surveyed by Franklin Wilbur and Leo Lambert in 1989 reported a marked increase in the number and scope of partnerships.

In his report to the Association for the Study of Higher Education, "High School/College Partnerships: Conceptual Models, Programs and Issues", Arthur Greenberg provides an in-depth and practical analysis of the high school/college partnership movement, focusing on concurrent enrollment models, compensatory education models, academic alliances, and teacher to teacher partnerships.

All the programs described in Greenberg's report have at least four characteristics in common. They all include secondary school teachers who practice in the schools. The college faculty involved often come from academic disciplines rather than schools of education. The programs are of long duration as opposed to the one time, expert consultation, or faculty guest lectures. Lastly, the programs described share the goal of professional development.

Two of these partnerships prove relevant to teachers of English. The National Writing Project constitutes a readily available opportunity for affiliation for institutions interested in improving writing instruction. It is also a well-established national model for programs that seek to affect larger numbers of students by training teachers to train other teachers.

The Academic Alliances Program is a newer but rapidly growing national network (more than 350 alliances currently exist) that brings teachers together around their shared disciplines. Academic Alliances are an attempt to bring together high school teachers and college faculty who have a common curricular focus to discuss common interests and concerns (Gross 15-17). Unlike most inservice programs offered to secondary school teachers, Academic Alliances provide events dominated by teachers, rather than by supervisors.

TEACHER TO TEACHER: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Although we were unfamiliar with the Academic Alliances program summarised above, the project that we designed shares at least two central features: Our focus was on practitioners within a discipline and we assumed a peer rather than a mentor relationship among the participating faculty. This small project had two complementary components: a survey questionnaire was sent to a random sample of high school, community college and university teachers in the Portland area (See Appendix 1). As part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked if they would participate in a two-hour focus group during the summer. If they agreed to participate in the focus group, they received a list of questions that might be the basis of the conversation in the focus groups (see Appendix 2). Each group had approximately nine members, with more high school and community college faculty than university faculty. The groups met for two hours each and the sessions were recorded and transcribed. Participants were also asked to fill out an evaluation form at the end of the session.

Out of 86 questionnaires sent, 50 were returned, a response rate of 58%. Overall, the teachers were experienced in class-room teaching and had numerous other responsibilities besides those asked of them in the classroom (for a summary of the questionnaire results, see Page 17). Of this larger group, 31 agreed to participate in our focus groups scheduled for July 10 at PSU. The results presented in the summary and in the narrative below are drawn from answers to the questionnaires and the transcriptions taken from recordings of the focus groups in July.

Questionnaires Sent		Questionnaires Received
High School	30	18
Community College	35	17
University	21	15
Focus Group Participants:		27
Evaluations Received:		21

RESULTS FROM THE TRANSCRIPTS

Two messages became clear from the "Teacher to Teacher" focus groups: the English classroom can become an "oasis" for students, in which the "gift" of reading and analytical skills may be imparted in an atmosphere of shared learning and community. On the other hand, teachers of English at every level have a hunger to share and discuss ideas and methods, to reinforce what they envisage is their obligation to the students. The focus group discussions can be categorized under three clear headings:

Changes Concerns Methods

Changes

Most teachers agreed that their class had become more student-oriented. The teachers were now facilitators or coaches, rather than lecturers, looking for ways to connect literature to the lives of their students. Teachers wanted students to relate to the literature, make their own connections and write of something valuable to their own human

condition. This connection automatically led to the teaching of more multiculturally-based texts.

Writing classes were becoming more text-based to develop reading and analytical skills. Students were encouraged more and more to synthesize the reading into experiences that they have themselves, not to separate them. Many teachers felt the responsibility for students relating to each other, for building a community within the English classroom. As a result, classrooms are becoming organized much more on directed group work - structured to a certain extent with set tasks - but with the students directing the choice of discussion, exploring the world outside the classroom through literature. In writing, peer critiquing was becoming more central. One teacher gave the example that if a peer looks directly at another and responds with a "What?!" to a thesis, it is far more powerful than a teacher's written comment "Where is your thesis?" Teachers believed that in such a classroom setting, students learn respect for and appreciation of one another's values. The students are ready to explore the world through literature if encouraged to give their own responses rather than please-the-teacher pat replies. Dialectic and Reading-Response Journals, which are gradually replacing book reports and papers, provide the arena for informed response. The role of the teacher was to facilitate a critical response: to give information where necessary and to promote critical thinking. Older students within the college classroom often operate as mentors within groups: bringing their wider world experience gives an added dimension to the literature. Most teachers agreed that the meshing of literature and writing is much more the way of the future -- literature and composition should never have been divorced was the general feeling. Students should be allowed "ownership" of a text, wear it any way they

wish, talk back to it, take pride in its cultural offerings: African-American students appreciating their own dialects was used as an example. Students should be encouraged to write to get into a novel and write to get out of it.

Methods

The discussion of methodology was fast and energized. The following is an amalgam of what teachers were finding successful in the classroom, for speed's sake written in a "how to" formula.

Instead of a lecture format and raising questions of one's own, take the discussion from students' questions on 3 by 5 cards at the start of the class after a reading assignment. "Real" questions develop rather than the ones the teacher supposes will be asked. Turn the reading over to the students after the initial teacher choice. If they choose a "bad" play or novel, use that as discussion of what values we bring to our choices as teachers. let the students plan the class -- let them choose the plays, the texts -- they are always better prepared when the students themselves are involved in the choice. If you choose the basic outline of the course, let them choose one text at the end that fits into your schema, or disrupts it, and let them write about the reasons for their choice.

Encourage the student to become a responder and use the teacher as a resource. Let multicultural students bring their own literature into the classroom for discussion. Hold the discussion in a circle for eye contact. Conduct research coupled with the community (the example of St. Vincent de Paul opposite Cleveland High was used). Methods such as Reading Response Journals and Dialectical Diaries were discussed. Some teachers discussed feed-back on sometimes personal expressions -- large Post-Its seemed a good way of showing interest without crippling response with a teacher's "essay" on the journal.

Retrieval Writing had produced good results: a lived experience related to one read. For example, the father\son relationship in Winterkill stimulated students into sharing their own experiences. Tied into this type of writing was the use of the Neighborhood Map: draw the map, then write and/or tell the peer all the associations from the past with that map. Intervention had also worked well: would Shakespeare have written about patterns of imagery or would he have preferred to develop an idea barely mentioned? Brabantio's dream in Othello or the ghost story in Winter's Tale for example. Use the "Tea-Party": issue invitations at random and the students become the character invited. Write the dialogue of that character over tea. Connected to this idea: if a character walked out of one text into another, what would the setting, plot change, dialogue be? Raise Outrageous Connections: How is Emily Dickinson like Nathaniel Hawthorne?

Encourage students to attend readings, theater productions. Share oneself with the students. Bring the canon into question; include gay texts, literature that deals with AIDS. . .discuss why such works are not openly studied or dealt with in criticism. One high-school teacher organized dinners with his seniors at local restaurants to open discussion. One professor held pot-luck super-readings at his house. Create an open classroom -- encourage students to go in the directions they need.

There is a place for the good lecture. Some high school students feel the need to obtain the "academic language". Fit lectures and notetaking into the need of the students and their developmental process. When you expose students to new concepts, new possibilities within the text, they find their own entry into issues; they then ask the questions that require them to go to the library for research which now grow at the right

developmental time. Tap into that right time by giving them the books to read that will lead them to the next books to read ....

Use other art forms to get into a text: a frieze on The Canterbury Tales -- each group takes a different tale and illustrates it. The frieze is then displayed. Publish the students' work. If a student prefaces a remark with: "This may not be right," stop and say: "Erase the first part". To avoid obviousness, too much self-relating and shallow interpretations, use the interpretation as a jumping-off point for more probing questions: "What exactly was it about the text that made you feel that way? Where exactly in the text did you see that?" Give your own purposefully misleading interpretation and question students if they accept it. Keep touchstones of response throughout the year (quarter) and trace the changes from beginning to end: from "I don't get it" to "Now I see why. . .". Prompt questions: "What are your expectations?" "What do you understand now that you didn't understand then? Try to account for that and connect with the rest of their experience in school, relationships. One teacher refers to this as the "Cosmic Paper" -- a term given by the students.

Overall, teachers claimed that Multiculturalism is the "humanely/educationally correct thing to do". Encourage different voices, texts by women authors, Korean, Afro-American, Native-American writers -- invite into the classroom speakers that demonstrate a different "voice" (see Appendix 3 for a summary of suggested areas of texts). Students then are encouraged to find their own authentic voice. Have enough faith to let go of the control--allow the students control with structure. Have the trust in the students that they will develop and recognize for themselves that the only time they read and write is not just in the classroom.

Concerns

Many teachers raised the specter of grading when teaching in a more relaxed, less-structured class. As one university teacher said: "We need to get around the grading. . .it turns us into watchdogs, policemen and women". Teachers suggested de-emphasizing grades and emphasizing what kind of learning leads to success. The question "What does the end of 121 require?" was used as an example of a question students should ask themselves. Teachers suggested grading when the student is ready and asks for it: "I'm ready to have this graded now". Students set time goals -- this would help with coach and team demands, SATS, Grad-school entry -- ask them what they are specifically proud of and grade those pieces. Some teachers revealed that they use very little grading but ample commenting and evaluating. Some teachers use student self-evaluation.

Some teachers worried over the letting-go of their role as lecturer in the classroom. They worried about what the students should know on the one hand and validating an affirming response on the other. They were concerned about how to set limits and boundaries yet still give the student integrity. They wanted an open classroom but needed "meat" (structure) to hang onto. They felt that the methods they were using were working, then other members of the faculty would comment on the English process: "You're not teaching the kids proper writing". Defining "proper" writing remains a concern." (Having one's methods validated means a great deal to teachers in the field. That is why more frequent focus groups of this nature would prove useful).

Some teachers worried over the "wooing" process necessary when some students were obviously still suffering from certain painful experiences in the English classroom. Some Junior High school students

were reported worrying about literary style -- wanting the form to plug in before they fully understood the reading and writing process. Some teachers were concerned about showing how the form grows out of how we think, not something imposed. A few teachers expressed concern over the politics behind the thinking in schools, that the way some teachers and students think is becoming increasingly frightening. An entire forum could be held on this idea alone.

Some teachers were enthusiastic about trying different methods but one thing that stopped them taking risks was student evaluations. When control from the institution is rigid it is hard to "free-up" the classroom. Risk taking for the student is difficult when the system is still so grade-oriented; journal and portfolio work become problematic especially when coaches or special program directors need early grades to track progress. Some teachers were concerned about rigidity in university classes and texts, that some universities were not keeping apace with innovative methods. Collaborative curricular work between the high schools and colleges would alleviate this problem.

The key words that accompanied the letting-go process were "facilitate" and "monitor". Teachers referred to themselves as reading/writing coaches. Nearly everyone liked classes in a circle with the teacher among the students, not at the front of the class. In that way everyone, including the teacher, participates and interacts. The word "oasis" was used for the English classroom--a place where students could find rest and peace from the frenetic quality of school or college life. The words "open classroom" and "community' were used to describe the feeling tecahers hoped to encourage within their classrooms. The key words that accompanied descriptions of the teacher's life were "hungry" and

"isolating". One college teacher expressed how she was "hungry to talk about what actually goes on in teaching literature". One highschool teacher expressed the limitations of time in her schedule to sit down and talk with her peers about what she does in the English classroom, describing her teaching life as "very isolating" . One community college teacher echoed this idea: "Teachers get pigon-holed and isolated". Obviously more forums such as this summer experience would help in alleviating these feelings of separation while satisfying the curiosity about what other teachers of English are doing in the classroom.

CONCLUSIONS

In Don't' Hold Them Back Baird Whitlock maintains that "the inner wall of separation within the academic community must be broken down. The distrust will never melt away until genuine conversation between the two groups of teachers begins" (34, emphasis added). The project "Teacher to Teacher" reported on above suggests that "genuine conversation" among various levels of teachers of literature is enthusiastically sought after by a fair number of teachers, perhaps especially when the format is egalitarian and participation is voluntary. Many of our respondents had participated in other similar situations, most particularly The National Writing Project in Oregon, in Eugene, and Lewis and Clark College in Portland. Several had also participated in a similar program offered at PSU each summer for credit. Almost all agreed that they would participate in such a format as the "Teacher to Teacher" again.

Participants in the focus groups were unanimously enthusiastic about the opportunity to share with others their successes and concerns about their teaching.

A sample of comments to the open-ended question "I found the focus group format" includes:

> "to be exhilarating, informative and anxious. I wanted to make sure I was heard and anxious to be validated by my peers."
>
> "very congenial. Interesting for the similarity of issues raised at different levels of teaching."
>
> "stimulating and enjoyable"
>
> "very dynamic. It had a life of its own and the participants were well qualified."

Participants shared a list of colleagues who might be interested in future focus groups and suggested a broad range of topics that such a format could explore: "moving towards a more inclusive canon"; "grading"; "how can we get students, at all levels, to read and write effectively"; "portfolio format". Everyone agreed they would be willing to participate again in a focus group.

By far the majority of respondents from our random survey and the focus groups had changed their teaching style over time, making it more "student-centered", adopting techniques from research on the writing process, and incorporating more multicultural texts. The responses to the questionnaires did not suggest teacher "burn-out", but did suggest a hunger for recognition in a society that apparently blames the educational system for events that many believe are out of the control of the school.

According to Greenberg such "teacher to teacher" dialogues as the one we conducted at PSU have benefits for both the college and high school faculties. For the high school teachers the benefits include a heightened sense of professionalism; improved self-esteem; increased knowledge of

their academic discipline; heightened expectations for students and an increased commitment to teaching careers.

College faculty who participate in the "teacher to teacher" programs gain a contemporary understanding of high school practice; have an opportunity to make college contributions that may be important for tenure and promotion considerations; have the potential to conduct writing workshops or research or prepare grant proposals, all of which can enhance the prestige of faculty members in the academic community.

Greenberg's summary of benefits focuses on a central issue that reoccurs for teachers throughout their careers: how to negotiate the demands of the students and the administration without sacrificing teaching quality. From the number of responses to our questionnaires, the level of participation in the focus groups, and the evaluations, our brief study supports Greenburg's findings. High school and community college faculty participated in greater numbers than their college counterparts. On the other hand, fewer post-secondary teachers were surveyed initially. Also a large percentage of part-time teachers from both the community college and university participated. It is likely that part-time faculty do not have as many opportunities as full-time faculty to develop a group of colleagues with whom to share teaching concerns. Similarly, they do not have as strong a voice in curricular matters -- from some of the surveys, several part-time faculty seemed frustrated by the silence imposed by their position.

The "art" of teaching was central to all our participants; they expressed a desire to participate in a setting where they could share as well as learn, where they could be acknowledged by their peers and give acknowledgement to other teachers, where they could be reassured that

the risks they incurred in the chaotic educational environment, threatened by decreased funding and attacks on public education, were not taken in isolation.

Despite our enthusiasm for the project and the benefits we felt everyone gained from the meeting in the pilot groups, some hesitations about taking the project further do exist. Summer seemed a good time to hold the groups because teachers would be less stressed but a number of teachers were attending other conferences or on vacation. It would be hard to find a good time to meet again when stress levels are low and time ample. For organizers and facilitators, pursuing full teaching loads, fulfilling the needs of committee work, as well as the communication required for the focus groups, all proved too much at times. The organizational details in promoting such an undertaking require more administrative assistance than we had anticipated. Any future study would necessitate either faculty release time or the administration's acceptance of the project as part of a teaching load.

Ideally, the format of the focus groups could be institutionalized so that teachers could meet on a regular basis around agreed sets of topics. From our summer experience such a program would be welcomed, useful, stimulating, and creative, all important values to nurture in the teaching of literature at all levels.

A SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE *

* The full research data may be obtained from The Department of English , Portland State University.

1) YEARS TEACHING:

Group Mean	17.04
High School	13.76
Community	14.47
University	24.14

7 out of 47 had taught for less than five years. The group mean may have been skewed by long-service university teachers but overall the group reveals itself as well established in the profession.

2) YEARS AT THE PRESENT INSTITUTON

Group Mean	10.70
High School	7.47
Community	9.05
University	17.07

Again skewed by the university number but the numbers state the stability of the group.

3) Other Schools Taught At--the majority of highschool teachers had taught previously within Oregon but Illinois and Idaho also featured. Community College teachers had a wider spread--Arizona, Micronesia, Nigeria, Vermont, to name a few--as did the university teachers--Bangkok, Belgrade, Nebraska and Scotland.

4) Alma Maters varied considerably covering a wide range within each group of teachers, more out of state schools than within.

5) There was a broad ranging spread for subjects taught. High school teachers carried the heaviest diversity ranging from Governance to Photography. 12 English and 1 count of writing show the Lit. and Comp. combination.

For the Community Colleges, Writing was split into:

Composition
English Composition
Writing

with a total of 15 courses counted out of 38.

ESL Grammar
ESL Writing
Professional Writing

gave a total of 4 as opposed to "separated out" literature sections as follows:

	American	2
	English	3
	Literature	6
	Shakespeare	1
with	Women/Gender	3

The university teachers as expected played into the specialized fields but still carried 10 composition classes.

6) Years at Present Institution:

Group Mean	3.90
HighSchool	4.65
Community College	3.53
University	3.42

7) For course level, as expected for such a stable, experienced group, most teachers were teaching at the upperlevels of their institutions.

8) Respondents revealed the wide ranging responsibilities for the group especially for the high school teachers--from football to language Arts Dept.Chair. It is no wonder that one high school teacher said that she had no time to sit and discuss methodology with her colleagues.

9) Ranking of importance of activities in the classroom:
The lowest ranking on all levels were Objective Tests. The highest ranking were Written Assignments and Relationship to students.

10a) The response to 10a about changes made confirms the discussions in the focus groups: student-centered, collaborative learning; a move from graded assignments to portfolios; reading and writing to learn; less lecturing, more small groups; multicultural texts, novel groupings instead of the canon.

10b) Why teachers made these changes hinged on attendance at national conferences and participation in writing programs, plus the students wanting more involvement in their own education. Availability of texts, books catching up to the needs of the students, and a general desire to give the students ownership of their courses, all played a part in a gradual change.

11) Multiculturalism depended on texts and films available, and encouraging foreign students to find their voice. Again the written answers backed up the focus group perspectives.

12a) Concerning the central strength of students, the college teachers recognized the benefit given by older students' experiences. Many throughout the sample saw the honesty in the modern-day student who will "smell a rat" in false assignment.

12b) How teachers build on the students' strengths depended on the value of accepting diversity and encouraging students to want more than they thought possible from the English class. A number of teachers throughout the sample saw ways to challenge students and respect them at the same time.

13) 31 answered Yes. In actuality 27 people attended the Focus Groups.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE WRITTEN ANSWERS

The answers to the questionnaires reveal that a vitality is at work in the teaching of English. There has been a definite shift away from the lecture format to the student-oriented classroom--a shift clearly demonstrated in the focus groups. Facilitator rather than lecturer seems to be the role of the teacher of English, one which encourages the voice of the students and all the cultural differences they bring to the community of an English classroom.

Pauline Beard
Susan Danielson
Kathi Ketcheson
Armando Laguardia

Portland State University. Oregon. December 1992.

WORKS CITED

Gaines , Bette C. and Franklin P.Wilbur.New Directions for Teaching and Learning. no.24.San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, December 1985.

Greenberg, Arthur Richard. "High School College Partnerships: Conceptual Models, Programs and Issues. " ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.5 Washington D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development, 1991.

Gross, T.L. Partners in Education San Francisco: Jossey Bass,1988.

Whitlock, .Baird .Don't Hold them Back (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978).

Wilbur, Franklin P. "High School-CollegePartnerships Can Work". Educational Record, Spring 1981.

_____. and Leo M. Lambert Linking Schools and Colleges: Guide to Partnerships & National Directory. Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1991

"TEACHER TO TEACHER"

Please take a few moments to answer the following questions.

1. How many years have you been teaching? _____

2. How many years have you been teaching at this school? _____

3. At which other schools have you taught?

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

4. From which college or university did you graduate?

   _____ _____

5. In which subject areas do you teach, currently?

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

6. How many classes do you teach each term? _____

7. At which course level do you teach? _____

8. What are your other responsibilities at the school?

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

9. Please rank the following according to their importance to what you do in the classroom:

	Not Important		Neutral		Very Important
Methodology	1	2	3	4	5
Choice of Texts	1	2	3	4	5
Relationship to Students	1	2	3	4	5
Written Assignments	1	2	3	4	5
Objective Tests	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 1

"TEACHER TO TEACHER"

Please take a few moments to answer the following questions.

1. How many years have you been teaching? _____

2. How many years have you been teaching at this school? _____

3. At which other schools have you taught?

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

4. From which college or university did you graduate?

   _____ _____

5. In which subject areas do you teach, currently?

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

6. How many classes do you teach each term? _____

7. At which course level do you teach? _____

8. What are your other responsibilities at the school?

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

9. Please rank the following according to their importance to what you do in the classroom:

	Not Important		Neutral		Very Important
Methodology	1	2	3	4	5
Choice of Texts	1	2	3	4	5
Relationship to Students	1	2	3	4	5
Written Assignments	1	2	3	4	5
Objective Tests	1	2	3	4	5

10a. In what ways has your own teaching changed over the past ten years (for example, in the books you have chosen, your classroom goals, classroom management, etc.)?

_____

_____

_____

10b. Why do you think you have made these changes?

_____

_____

_____

11. In what ways do you introduce multiculturalism into your literature classroom?

_____

_____

_____

12a. What do you consider to be the central strength of your students?

_____

_____

12b. How do you build on that strength?

_____

_____

13. Would you agree to participate in a round table discussion on the issues raised by your and your colleagues' answers to these questions? __ Yes __ No

Thank you for you cooperation. If you indicated that you are interested in the round tables, we will contact you with additional information. If you have any questions, please contact Susan Danielson or Pauline Beard in the PSU Department of English, 725-3521.

SD/PB:kak
6/5/92

APPENDIX 2

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

In what ways has your own teaching changed over the past ten years (considering books chosen, classroom goals, classroom management, etc.?) why do you think you have made these changes?

What do your students appear to find most difficult about their literature classes?

What types of assignments do you give to help them with these difficulties?

What has been your most successful assignment?

In what ways do you introduce multiculturalism into your literature classroom?

What do you consider to be the central strength of your students? How do you build on that strength?

What do you consider to be the central weakness of your students? How do help them to overcome that weakness?

APPENDIX 3

A Sampling of Multicultural Texts/Tapes/Videos and Works of Interest

AIIIEEEEE!	Anthology of AsianAmerican Literature.
Elvia Alvarado	Don't Be Afraid Gringo
Gloria Anzaldua	Making Face, Making Soul.
Carol Black	After the Baptism
Sandra Cisneros	The House on Mango Street
	My Wicked Wicked Ways
Carlos Fuentes	The Old Gringo
Craig Lesley	Winterkill
Kamala Markandayna	Nectar in the Sieve **
Wiliam L.Heat Moon	Blue Highways
Bharati Mukherjee	Jasmine **
Alexander Sitnaro	My Wicked Wicked Ways
Lawrence Thornton	Imagining Argentina
Richard Wright	Black Boy

Man of Respect	Macbeth film Mafioso style
Edward 11	gay portrayal

Sharon Olds and Galway Kinnell reading love poetry followed by Judith Barrington.

Writing Text:	Habits of the Heart
	Ourselves Among Ourselves
To Read Literature	ed.Donald Holland and Carol Blye